



**Date:** December 18, 2003  
**To:** Members, Staff Work Group on Urban Water Use Measurement  
**From:** Eric Poncelet and Bennett Brooks, CONCUR  
**Re:** Key Outcomes: December 5, 2003 Staff Work Group Meeting

---

Thank you for participating in the Urban Water Use Measurement Staff Work Group meeting held December 5, 2003 in Sacramento. Please find below a brief summary of key outcomes from the meeting.

## I. Participants

The following Urban Water Use Measurement Work Group members participated in the December 5, 2003 meeting:

Jeff Barnickol, SWRCB (phone)	Tim Treloar, Cal. Water Service (phone)
David Todd, DWR	Mike Hollis, MWD of Southern CA (phone)
Nadine Feletto, DHS	Dick Bennett, EBMUD (phone)
Mary Lou Cotton, Castaic Lake W.D. (phone)	Luis Generoso, San Diego Water Department (phone)
Steve Macaulay, CUWA	Roberta Borgonovo, CA League of Women Voters
Lucille Billingsley, USBR	

Facilitation team members present included Tom Gohring (California Bay-Delta Authority Assistant Deputy Director, Water Management), Lee Axelrad (Resources Law Group), and Bennett Brooks and Eric Poncelet (both of CONCUR, Inc.).

## II. Meeting Materials

The following meeting materials were provided in advance of or at the meeting:

- Agenda and Discussion Notes
- Draft Definition of Appropriate Urban Water Use Measurement
- Strawman Draft Implementation Approach

## III. Key Outcomes

### A. Updates:

- **Staff Work Group Representation Changes:** Mary Lou Cotton, Assistant to the General Manager of Castaic Lake Water Agency, has joined the Work Group.
- **Report on recent ACWA Water Use Efficiency and Conservation sub-committee meeting:** Staff Work Group members reported that Mary Ann Dickinson, assisted by other Staff Work Group members (Steve Macaulay and Mary Lou Cotton), briefed

members of the ACWA Water Use Efficiency subcommittee on the status of the CBDA appropriate measurement initiative. From the reaction to this briefing, it is apparent that many in the water user community are unaware of the Authority's efforts in this regard. Staff Work Group members therefore recommended that Authority staff conduct preliminary outreach to both water purveyors (CUWA and non-CUWA) and Environmental Water Caucus members and that this outreach clearly address: 1) the impetus for this effort, 2) the content of Authority staff's draft recommendations, and 3) the process by which this proposal will be reviewed and finalized. Mary Lou Cotton agreed to work with ACWA to try to set up another briefing.

- **Authority staff coordination with legislative process:** Tom Gohring reported that several CBDA senior staff met the week of December 1, 2003 to discuss options for proposing legislation on appropriate measurement. Authority staff decided not to put in a placeholder for legislation in the ongoing 2003-2004 session (as this was considered to be premature) but rather to focus efforts on finding other bills to which appropriate measurement legislation could be attached. Tom Gohring asked Staff Work Group members to keep him apprised of possibilities.

## **B. Discussion of Revised Draft Definition of Appropriate Urban Water Use Measurement**

1. **Broad Work Group Support:** Work Group members expressed continued broad support for the document. They agreed that it was far enough along to be vetted in a preliminary fashion with stakeholder groups and the public.
2. **Executive summary for public vetting:** Participants recommended that a concise summary of the draft implementation approach be produced to support a preliminary round of stakeholder outreach. Particular attention needs to be placed on the following elements:
  - Clear description of the history and impetus for the project, the link to the CALFED ROD, and the broader state water management objectives being served.
  - Clear explication that the current draft stems from a staff-driven, largely technically-focused process.
  - Clear description of what is actually new in the proposed draft relative to what is already in place
  - Clear delineation of what actions are expected to be accomplished in the short versus long term.
  - Clear description of the anticipated timeline and process for producing the draft Implementation Approach.
3. **Key issues addressed:** Participants discussed the following key issues:
  - *Objectives of overall urban water use measurement effort.* Several participants questioned whether all of the actions called out in the draft definition were appropriate, as some of them go beyond the scope of water use efficiency. Tom Gohring responded that there are four primary state water management objectives being served:
    - Provide better information on statewide and regional water use to support planning;
    - Allow users to undertake and demonstrate the effects of water use efficiency measures;
    - Facilitate valid water transfers; and
    - Facilitate more effective allocation of water within the state.Authority staff/consultants committed to making these objective more clear in the definition and implementation approach documents.

- *Groundwater substitution transfers.* Participants noted that it is likely that some stakeholders will see groundwater substitution transfers as largely an agricultural issue. Consequently, participants recommended that the draft definition and implementation approach explicitly state how such transfers pertain to urban water use. Additionally, several participants questioned the appropriateness of “power meters” as an accurate means of continuous measurement of groundwater wells. Authority staff/consultants will address these two issues in the next iteration of the drafts.
- *Supply water assessment and verification.* Participants agreed that the task of “data collection and reporting of the differences between actual versus projected water use” be moved from a proposed purveyor reporting requirement to a research project to be called out in the research program. Participants cited the paperwork burdens and the inherent difficulties in maintaining a distinction between a base and changes made over time as primary reasons for shifting this action to research.
- *Measurement of irrigated landscape water use.* Participants recommended that the proposed research on irrigated landscape water use not be limited to a focus on dedicated landscape meters but also be opened to other technologies such as ET controllers and remote sensing.

### C. Discussion of Strawman Draft Implementation Approach

1. **General Work Group Support:** Tom Gohring walked the Work Group through the Draft Implementation Approach document. Participants expressed broad support for the Program Manager’s general approach to implementation vehicles.
2. **Key discussion items:** Participants commented on the following key topics:
  - *State water management objectives.* Participants requested that the introductory section include and make clear the four state water management objectives driving this process (see section III.B.3 above).
  - *State standards/protocols for recording and reporting urban water use data.* Several water purveyor representatives requested that the action calling for the development of state standards/protocols for recording and reporting urban water use include clearer reference to the need to reduce the reporting redundancy being faced by water purveyors.
  - *Measurement of water bank transfers.* Participants questioned whether appropriate measurement also included measurement of groundwater transfers from water banks. Authority staff and consultants will consider this further and present the findings at the next Work Group meeting.
  - *Role of County Sealers of Weights and Measures in urban water purveyor measurement tasks.* Several water purveyor representatives requested that Authority staff clarify the role expected of County Sealers of Weights and Measures in the measurement of sources and customer deliveries. These participants suggested that County Sealers of Weights and Measures do not play a major role in water purveyor measurement tasks and that listing these officials as “key implementation partners” is misleading. Authority staff/consultants noted that they viewed the role of County Sealers of Weights and Measures as a supporting one but that this role did not extend to certification of customer meter accuracy and maintenance.

- *Constraints faced by Investor-Owned Utilities.* Tim Treloar expressed several concerns shared by Investor-Owned Utilities. In cases where legislation is needed and carries with it a cost impact, IOUs may require rate relief from the CPUC. Rate relief may also be appropriate in cases where meter-induced water savings result in diminished revenue for IOUs. Authority staff agreed to work with Tim to address these concerns in the implementation approach.
- *Relation to USBR measurement and reporting requirements.* Lucille Billingsley (USBR) recommended that language be added stating that the reporting requirements described do not pre-empt existing CVPIA requirements for CVP contractors.

#### D. Discussion of Process/Timeline for Producing Staff Draft on Implementation Approach

The current anticipated timeline for producing a draft Implementation Approach is as follows:

Dec.-Jan.	-Work with Staff Work Group to produce draft Implementation Approach. -Conduct outreach within Work Group member organizations. -Conduct preliminary outreach within water purveyor and environmental communities.
Feb.-March	-Conduct public workshops to vet Draft Implementation Approach. -Review by WUE Subcommittee.
March	-Review by BD-PAC. -Conduct workshops for Bay-Delta Authority members.
April	-Review by Bay-Delta Authority.

### IV. Next Steps

- **Produce summary status report of current draft Implementation Approach:** Authority staff and consultants to produce a brief summary status report to assist Staff Work Group members with outreach. Authority staff to submit a draft of this “Overview” document to Staff Work Group by December 12, 2003 for comment. Comments will be due early the following week.
- **Organize and schedule outreach activities:** Authority staff and consultants to work with Staff Work Group members to organize and schedule outreach briefings as soon as possible on the current draft Implementation Approach. Staff Work Group members will provide updates to appropriate policy and/or operations personnel within their own organizations. Other key organizations to be contacted include: CUWA, key non-CUWA purveyors, ACWA, EWC, CUWCC.
- **Schedule next meeting of Staff Work Group:** Authority staff and consultants to contact Work Group members to set up next Staff Work Group meeting for early January, 2004.
- **Revise documents for next Staff Work Group meeting:** Authority staff and consultants to revise draft Definition and Implementation Approach documents per the comments received during the December 5, 2003 meeting for review at the next Staff Work Group meeting.